

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action dated July 23, 2004, has been noted, and its contents carefully studied. In light of the foregoing amendments, reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, 103 and/or 112 is courteously requested.

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the time taken to discuss the merits of the above-identified application. In this regard, it is noted that no agreement was reached. On the other hand, the Examiner indicated that pending further searching, claims corresponding to, for example, the subject matter of, for example, Claim 17 may be allowable particularly as it relates to multiple Web-coding workstations. It is also noted that the Examiner was troubled by the recitation in Claims 1 and 8 which call for at least one Web-coding workstation for a user to establish a classification for a network resource locator of a created list. In this regard, the Examiner indicated that this appeared close to the system disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 6,483,525 to Tange et al.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of Claim 18 and the objection to Claim 8, amendment to these claims has been made and it is believed that sufficient reasons have been provided to enable the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and the objection. More specifically, with respect to Claim 18, "the voting system" has been changed to "said classification". As to the objection to Claim 8, a careful review of the previously submitted amendment clearly shows that the term in the seventh line of the claim is clearly "at least one" with the letter "a" having a strikethrough. Nonetheless, this amendment is again being submitted for the Examiner's consideration. If the Examiner still perceives that the change has not been made, he is authorized to make the change mentioned in paragraph 3 of the Office Action in the claim objections to reflect his proposal.

In light of the foregoing amendments, and newly added claims, it is respectfully urged that amendments have been made to the claims and new claims added which clearly and patentably distinguish over the cited references as discussed hereafter.

Turning to independent Claims 1 and 8, it is noted that these claims have now been amended such that the network research locator is sent to a graphical user interface component of at least one separate Web-coding workstation which is connected to the network and is separate

from the users of the network. The network resource locator step is not conducted at the Web-coding workstation. The prior art conducts the location and storing at a same workstation, i.e., single user computer. Further, Claim 1 further requires that the classification is stored in a separate database in relation to the resource locator and in relation to said at least one Web-coding workstation. It is important to appreciate that these claims clearly identify the list of network resource locators as being created by identifying network resources accessed by users of the network, not the users of the Web-coding workstation. This is in contrast with the references which create a database by accessing websites by a single user on a computer who then creates an arranged database on the same computer in accordance with the user's own preferred classification scheme.

As further recited in new independent Claims 23 and 24, there is described a method and system in which each network resource locator of a created list is first sorted based on the number of unique users having access to a resource identified by the network resource locator, and then sent to a graphical user interface component of the at least one separate Web-coding workstation connected to the network. The classification is assigned based on receiving the source selection for the sorted list from the at least one Web-coding workstation, and the classification is then stored in a separate database in relation to the resource locator and in relation to the at least one Web-coding workstation.

New Claim 25 calls for more than one Web-coding workstation as does claim 26. Claims 17, 18 and 21 call for the various level multiple Web-coding workstation classification scheme discussed with the Examiner.

It is respectfully urged that the invention as now recited in the claims is not anticipated or obvious from the cited references under 35 U.S.C. 102 and/or 103, as will become more clearly evident from the following detailed discussion of these references presented herein for the Examiner's kind consideration.

U.S. Patent No. 6,483,525 to Tange et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,483,525 to Tange et al. (hereinafter Tange) merely teaches a browser apparatus for browsing a variety of home pages which is especially configured so that the address of a home page can be classified and registered through a user carrying out a drag and

drop action of its pointer with a mouse operation to shift an item displayed in a region of the screen with home pages displayed to one of classifications determined by the user and displayed on the screen. This allows the registration of a home page address for favorite home pages to be simplified (see, for example, Abstract, and Fig. 4 which shows the various classifications under the category "favorites".)

More particularly, in operation, the browser apparatus is connected to an internet service provider and allows the user to download and browse various home pages offered by a number of servers on the internet, (column 4, lines 1-3). A home page menu is selected by the user operating the mouse. The CPU displays a pull-down menu of a second viewport where a group of classifications predetermined by the user appears as folder icons. The pointer is operated by the user for drag and drop action from any item in the home page display or the address display to a desired one of the icons. The user presses down a button of the mouse with the pointer moved and located at the item in the home page display area or the address display area while the button remaining pressed down, drags the pointer to the icon and the user then releases the button of the mouse at the icon (column 4, lines 38-51).

It is important to appreciate that it is a single user using a single computer that creates the classifications and selects how to classify web pages browsed by that single user. Thus, while broadly corresponding to a method for classifying information available on a computer network, the teachings of Tange have nothing to do with the claimed invention which includes receiving a list of network locators which is created by identifying network resources accessed by users (plural) of the network. Yet still further, there is nothing in Tange standing alone or in combination with the other references which teaches sorting the list based on the number of unique users having access to a resource, for classifying the locations accessed by users of the network by separate users of the Web-coding workstations. More specifically, there is clearly nothing in Tange which teaches or suggests, standing alone or in combination with other references, the method and system of claims 23 and 24 which in one aspect require the specifically defined sorting of the list.

Further, there is nothing in Tange which teaches or suggests more than one Web-coding workstation and the multilevel voting system and methods of claim 17, 18, 21 and 26.

U.S. Patent No. 6,356,899 to Chakrabarti et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,356,899 to Chakrabarti et al. (hereinafter Chakrabarti) teaches a method for enabling a single user to interactively create a frame-based hierarchical organizational structure for information elements, including steps to identify and automatically filter and rank by relevance, information elements, such as world wide web pages for populating the structure, to form, for example, a searchable, world wide web page database (Abstract).

The method and system of Chakrabarti includes steps for generating an initial set of pages based upon frame attributes, and then through an iterative process of issuing queries and following links into and out of already fetched pages, the iteration is carried out and the initial set is supplemented and expanded to form a root set upon which later computation can be performed (column 8, lines 22-29). Following creating of the root set, the method includes steps for associating a hub-weight parameter and authority-weight parameter with each web page, and iteratively calculating the relevance for the pages of the root set based on the resulting, respective, hub-weight and authority-weight values for each page (column 8, lines 30-35).

Thus, it is clear that Chakrabarti only teaches a system and method in which a single user selects the topic, searches and rates on relevance in accordance with the user's preferences. Chakrabarti again fails to teach the claimed features of classifying information available on a computer network in which a list of network resource locators is received, with the list being created by identifying network resources access by users (plural) of the network. Chakrabarti also fails to teach or suggest that for each resource locator of the list, sending the network resource locator to at least one separate Web-coding workstation connected to the network and receiving a selection from the at least one Web-coding workstation, with each selection representing a classification for the resource by the user of the Web-coding workstation. In accordance with the invention, the classification is not done by a user of the network.

Similarly, Chakrabarti fails to teach or suggest a method and system in which the list is sorted based on the number of unique users having access to a resource, for classifying the locations accessed by users of the network by at least one separate user of the Web-coding workstation.

As in the case with Tange, there is also nothing in Chakrabarti which teaches or suggests more than one Web-coding workstation and the multilevel voting system and method of claims 17, 18, 21, and 26.

U.S. Patent No. 5,400,248 to Chisholm

U.S. Patent No. 5,400,248 to Chisholm (hereinafter Chisholm) is believed to have been wrongly identified by the Examiner in the Office Action. More specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner refers to Chisholm as being a patent to Tso but references the above-noted patent number. Based on a reading of the Office Action, and with reference to the specific patent number listed, it is clear that the Examiner is referring to the Chisholm patent, and this is what is discussed herein.

Turning to the teachings of Chisholm, it merely describes a voting system that allows voters to express and cast votes that are conditional on the votes of others of the voting group. More specifically, the system is used by two or more persons to arrive at a decision and allows the users to vote either unconditionally or conditionally on the votes of others within a voting group. The intent of the system is to avoid locked decisions by providing information back to voters which allow voters to modify their votes to arrive at a consensus within a group. This has nothing to do with a method for classifying information available on a computer network and adds nothing to the teachings of the afore-mentioned Tange and Chakrabarti references.


Finally, for the sake of completeness, Tso has been reviewed and refers to U.S. Patent No. 6,385,602 which merely relates to an approach for presenting search results using dynamic categorization which involves examining search results and dynamically establishing one or more categories of search results based upon attributes of the search result. Examples are given to searches for types of automobiles. It is clear that this reference, which appears to have been improperly referenced in the Office Action, adds nothing to the teachings of the other references cited.

Application No. 09/606,683
Amendment and Response dated November 23, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 23, 2004
Express Mail No. EV406623044US

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully urged that all of the claims clearly define patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 102, 103 and/or 112. Nonetheless, should the Examiner have any comments, questions or suggestions of the nature necessary to expedite prosecution of the application, or to place the application in condition for allowance, he is courteously requested to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

November 23, 2004



A. José Cortina, Reg. No. 29,733
Daniels Daniels & Verdonik, P.A.
P.O. Drawer 12218
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Voice 919.544.5444
Fax 919.544.5920

Email jcortina@d2vlaw.com

F:\CL\1310-006\Prosecution\RCE OA Response.doc